



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/582,261	02/27/2007	Martin Bussmann	011235.57691US	1255
23911 7590 09/15/2010 CROWELL & MORING LLP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP P.O. BOX 14300 WASHINGTON, DC 20044-4300			EXAMINER SMITH, NICHOLAS A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1795	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/15/2010 PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/582,261

Applicant(s)

BUSSMANN ET AL.

Examiner

NICHOLAS A. SMITH

Art Unit

1795

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 3 and 4 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/CD)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/9/06, 5/27/10.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: ____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Applicant cannot rely upon the foreign priority papers to overcome the rejection under Mielke (US 7462273 B2) because a translation of said papers has not been made of record in accordance with 37 CFR 1.55. See MPEP § 201.15.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 4 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 4 depends from a cancelled claim (claim 1). Appropriate correction is required. For the purpose of examination, it is assumed claim 4 depends from claim 3.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mielke.

5. In regards to claim(s) 3, Mielke discloses a method of manufacturing blisk blades using a molded cathode by electrochemical machining that creates a negative structure on the blisk blades that minimizes boundary layers in one manufacturing step (abstract, col. 1, line 60 to col. 2, line 48; Figs. 5-8). Production of a high surface finish is a

smooth layer that minimizes boundary layers, since a high surface finish is a minimum amongst low surface finishes (col. 1, lines 35-48).

6. In regards to claim(s) 4, Mielke discloses pulsed electrochemical machining (col. 1, lines 35-48, pulsed voltage for linear oscillating electrode).

7. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lamphere et al. (EP 1314507 A2) as submitted on Applicant's Information Disclosure Statement on 9 June 2006.

8. Lamphere et al. discloses a method of manufacturing blisk blades using a molded cathode (**26b** and **26a**, figure 3, cathodes molded to match concave and convex sides of a blisk blade) by electrochemical machining that creates a negative structure on the blisk blades that minimizes boundary layers in one manufacturing step (para [0029]-[0030]). Production of the concave and convex sides of a blisk blade to final, precision dimensions (para [0024]-[0025]) inherently minimizes boundary layers because a blisk blade is designed to reduce boundary layer effects for efficiency, and that a blisk blade to final dimensions is a minimum amongst a blisk blade with bulk dimensions.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lamphere et al. in view of Gimaev et al (DE 2903873 A).
11. Lamphere et al. does not explicitly disclose using pulsed ECM.
12. Gimaev et al. discloses a method of producing a precision metal part by using pulsed ECM (abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Lamphere et al. with Gimaev et al.'s pulsed machining because Gimaev et al. teaches that using pulsed ECM allows for the electrode gap to be maintained accurately (Gimaev et al., abstract).

Conclusion

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NICHOLAS A. SMITH whose telephone number is (571)272-8760. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM, Monday through Friday.
14. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexa Neckel can be reached on (571)-272-1446. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

15. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

NAS

/Alexa D. Neckel/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1795